

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Charlie Quattlebaum III,

PLAINTIFF

v.

Andrew M. Saul, Commissioner of  
Social Security,

DEFENDANT

Case No. 2:18-cv-03207-TLW

**Order**

This social security matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (R&R) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 12. In the R&R, the magistrate judge recommends reversing the Commissioner's decision and remanding the case. The Commissioner filed a notice informing the Court that no objections would be filed. ECF No. 14. This matter is now ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the R&R to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in the R&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident*

*Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the R&R. Having found no clear error on the face of the record, the R&R is **ACCEPTED** and the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED**. This case is **REMANDED** to the Commissioner for further proceedings consistent with the R&R and this order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*  
Terry L. Wooten  
Senior United States District Judge

February 11, 2020  
Columbia, South Carolina